

Total Number of Pages in This Submission

08-04-03



0630/1G184US1

Approved for use through 04/30/2003. OMB 0544003

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMM

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control no

Attorney Docket Number

Application Number 09/695,446-Conf. #2608 **TRANSMITTAL** Filing Date October 24, 2000 **FORM** Suzana PETANCESKA First Named Inventor Art Unit 1615 (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing) **Examiner Name** T. Ware

ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)			
Fee Transi	mittal Form	Drawing(s)	After Allowance Communication to Group
Fee	Attached	Licensing-related Papers	Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences
X Amendment/Reply		Petition	Appeal Communication to Group (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)
After	Final	Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application	Proprietary Information
Affid	avits/declaration(s)	Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address	Status Letter
Extension of Time Request		Terminal Disclaimer	Other Enclosure(s) (bease identify below)?
Express Abandonment Request		Request for Refund	identify below?
Information Disclosure Statement		CD, Number of CD(s)	
Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)			
Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application		Remarks	
Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53			
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT			
Firm or Individual name	DARBY & DARBY P.C. Kristin E. Behrendt - 45,599		
Signature	Krista Behndt		
Date	August 1, 2003		

Customer No.: 32801

EV305483436-US 8/1/03

Express Mail Label No. Dated: EXPRESS MAIL CERTIFICATE

PLEASE CHARGE ANY DEFICIENCY UP TO \$300.00 OR CREDIT

fee was deposited with the U.S. Postal Service & that it was addressed for delivery to the Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231 by "Express

ANY EXCESS IN THE FEES DUE WITH THIS DOCUMENT TO OUR **DEPOSIT ACCOUNT NO. 04-0100**

Addressee" service.

BPec

Customer No.: 32801 Docket No: 0630/1G184US1

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

Suzana PETANCESKA; Sam GANDY; Donald E. FRAIL

Serial No.:

09/695,446

OF

Art Unit:

1615

Confirmation No.: 2608

Filed: 10/24/2000

Examiner:

Todd WARE

For:

METHODS

IDENTIFYING

AND **USING** AMYLOID-INHIBITORY

COMPOUNDS

RESPONSE

Hon. Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks Washington, DC 20231

August 1, 2003

Sir:

In response to the Official Action of July 2, 2003, Applicants provisionally elect, with traverse, the invention of Group I, claims 1-6 and 20-25 drawn to methods for reducing amyloid beta or treating a disease through reduction of amyloid beta with an estrogen compound, classified in class 514, subclass 182, with traversal.

The restriction requirement is submitted almost 3 years after the filing of this application on October 24, 2000, and after examination of all of the claims. The instant application was filed with 30 claims reciting subject matter corresponding to the presently pending claims. Applicants have received two office actions on the merits, including a Final Office Action mailed on July 3, 2002. A telephonic interview was held between Applicants and the Examiner on September 24, 2002. Applicants submitted a response to the Final Office Action and filed a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) on January 1, 2003. Subsequently, the Restriction Requirement of July 2, 2003 was issued.

It is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of claims 1-30, pending for almost three years, has already been searched and examined on the merits. With the case searched and examined during the three year time period, a new unforeseen burden should not unexpectedly arise for Applicants RCE. In fact, any present burden on the examiner to perform a search of the subject matter for examination on the merits has already been entirely eliminated. Under MPEP §803, "[i]f the search and examination of the entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions." Applicants respectfully submit that not only should this policy be applied to the instant application, but that the Patent Office should consider the extended period of time of the substantive examination of the instant application and the prejudice to Applicants by requiring restriction at this late date.

U.S. Serial No.: 09/695,446
Response to Official Action of July 2, 2003

Docket No.: 0630/1G184-US1

Page 2

Applicants also respectfully point out the regulation under 37 C.F.R. § 1.142 wherein a restriction requirement "will normally be made before any action on the merits; however, it may be made at any time before final action." While the finality of the Office Action of July 3, 2002 was withdrawn, requiring restriction at this stage in prosecution seems only to serve the purpose of unnecessarily extending the prosecution time of this application, and indeed is contrary to the regulation.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the restriction requirement. Applicants also reserve the right without prejudice to file the subject matter of the non-elected claims in a divisional application.

Respectfully submitted,

Kristin E. Behrendt

Reg. No. 45,599

Attorney for Applicants

DARBY & DARBY PC 805 Third Avenue

New York, NY 10022

Phone (212) 527-7700

RECEIVED

MAY 0.3 2004

TECH CENTER 1600/2900

U.S. Serial No.: 09/695,446 Response to Official Action of July 2, 2003 Docket No.: 0630/1G184-US1

Page 3